

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALEXIS CRAWFORD and BETHANY
MCAULEY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHEVRON CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-05114-JHC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

Before the Court is Defendant Chevron Corporation’s “Motion for Extension of Time to File Responsive Pleading.” Dkt. # 24. The Court has considered the motion, the balance of the record, and the applicable law. Being fully advised, the Court GRANTS the motion.

On March 13, 2023, Plaintiffs filed their complaint, alleging that a Chevron gas station employee discriminated against Plaintiffs. Dkt. # 9 at 7. On May 2, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion requesting service of the summons and complaint by court officers. Dkt. # 20. The Court ordered the U.S. Marshal or Deputy Marshal to serve Defendants by no later than June 3, 2023. *Id.* at 2.

On June 21, 2023, Chevron filed this motion. Dkt. ## 24–25. Chevron seeks an extension of time, until July 14, 2023, to file its “responsive pleading” and to meet “any related

1 deadlines (including the deadline to file a Corporate Disclosure Statement).” Dkt. # 24 at 1.
2 Chevron mentions no specific “related” deadlines. *See id.*

3 When an act must be done before a deadline, courts may extend the time required to
4 complete the act for “good cause.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). Good cause is a “non-rigorous
5 standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts.” *Ahanchian*
6 *v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). Under the good cause standard,
7 extensions of time should normally be granted if there is no bad faith on the part of the movant
8 or prejudice to the nonmovant. *Id.*

9 Good cause exists to grant an extension for Chevron to file its answer. There is no
10 evidence that Chevron’s counsel acted in bad faith or that an extension will prejudice Plaintiffs.
11 The requested extension is brief, and the case is in its early stages. Chevron offers two
12 persuasive reasons why it needs an extension. First, Chevron says that it has been unable to meet
13 and confer with Plaintiff Alexis Crawford, Dkt. # 24 at 1–2, who is incarcerated and recently was
14 moved from a Washington correctional facility to one in Oregon, *see* Dkt. # 22 at 2. And
15 second, because Chevron contends that it does not own, operate, or control the gas station where
16 the alleged incident occurred, it requires more time to identify the other defendants. Dkt. # 24 at
17 2.

18 For the above reasons, the Court GRANTS the motion. Dkt. # 24. Chevron must file its
19 answer on or before July 14, 2023. The Court similarly extends the deadlines to file a corporate
20 disclosure statement and for the parties’ Rule 26(f) conference to July 14, 2023. Should Chevron
21 wish to extend any other deadlines, it may move for such relief.

22 /

23 /

24 /

1 Dated this 7th day of July, 2023.

2 

3 John H. Chun

4 United States District Judge